

Claim 1 defines an ammunition article including a molded plastic cartridge casing body having a first end and a second end, and a projectile attached to the first end of the cartridge casing body. The cartridge casing body is molded around at least a portion of the projectile. As discussed above, Grelle, et al. does not disclose, *inter alia*, a projectile, much less a projectile attached to the first end of a cartridge casing body.

In view of the differences between Claim 1 and Grelle, et al., it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by, and defined patentably over Grelle, et al.

Claim 21 defines an ammunition article including a cartridge casing body having an first end and a second end, a projectile attached to the first end of the cartridge casing body, and a single piece, molded plastic base, the base being attached to the second end of the cartridge casing body.

As noted above, Grelle, et al. does not disclose a projectile, much less a projectile attached to an end of a cartridge casing body as recited in Claim 21. Accordingly, Grelle, et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in Claim 21.

In view of the differences between Claim 21 and Grelle, et al., it is respectfully submitted that Claim 21 and the Claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by, and defined patentably over, Grelle, et al.

Claim 114 defines an ammunition article including a projectile having cannellure and a molded cartridge casing body molded around at least a portion of the projectile such that a portion of a wall of the cartridge casing body follows the cannellure contours of the projectile.

Grelle, et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in Claim 114, including a projectile having cannellure contours, and a molded cartridge casing body molded around at least a portion of the projectile such that a portion of a wall of the cartridge casing body follows the cannellure contours of the projectile.

In view of the differences between Claim 114 and Grelle, et al., it is respectfully submitted that Claim 114 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by, and defined patentably over, Grelle, et al.

Claims 13-18 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grelle, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,192,233 to Dumortier. Dumortier is cited as disclosing an ultrasonic welding method of attachment between a base and a casing body of a plastic cartridge. Dumortier, however, cures none of the defects of Grelle, et al. with respect to Claims 1 and 21, from which Claims 13-18 and 29-34 depend, respectively. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 21, and the claims dependent therefrom, defined patentably over Grelle, et al. in view of Dumortier for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with regard to Claims 1 and 21 being patentably distinguishable from Grelle, et al.

Claims 5, 7-8 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grelle, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,572,078 to Bell. Bell discloses that a cartridge case 12 may be made of a plastic material and that a projectile 18 is retained in an opening 16 of the cartridge 12 by a crimp 20.

Claims 5 and 7-8 depend from Claim 1. Neither Grelle, et al. nor Bell discloses a combination of features including a cartridge casing body that is molded around at least a

portion of a projectile, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Claim 1 and the Claims dependent therefrom, including Claims 5 and 7-8, define patentably over Grelle, et al. in view of Bell.

Claims 24-25 depend from Claim 21, which recites a combination of features including a cartridge casing body having a first end and a second end, a projectile attached to the first end of the cartridge casing body, and a single piece, molded plastic base, the base being attached to the second end of the cartridge casing body. As discussed above, Grelle, et al. relates to a shotgun-typed cartridge and a projectile is not attached to the cartridge casing. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the disclosures of Grelle, et al. and Bell in the manner asserted in the Official Action, except of the result of hindsight reconstruction based upon the present application.

In view of the differences between claim 21 and the claims dependent therefrom, including Claims 24 and 25, and Grelle, et al. in view of Bell, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 21 and the claims dependent therefrom define patentably over Grelle, et al. in view of Bell.

Claims 10 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grelle, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,928,598 to Sabranski, et al. Sabranski, et al. is cited as disclosing a reusable, cylindrically symmetrical metal base 5. Claims 10 and 27 depend from Claims 1 and 21, respectfully, and recite that the base is reusable and the cartridge casing body is replaceable.

As discussed above, Claim 1 recites a combination of features including a cartridge casing body that is molded around at least a portion of a projectile. Neither Grelle, et al. nor

Sabranski, et al. discloses or suggests this combination of features. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom, including Claim 10, define patentably over Grelle, et al. in view of Sabranski, et al. As noted above, Claim 21 recites a combination of features including a single piece, molded plastic base. Sabranski, et al. discloses that the replaceable base 5 is made of metal. Col. 2, line 34. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the combination of Grelle, et al. in view of Sabranski, et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in Claim 21. Accordingly, Claim 21 and the claims dependent therefrom, including Claim 27, define patentably over Grelle, et al. in view of Sabranski, et al.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance is cordially urged.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 

Harold R. Brown III  
Registration No. 36,341

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620

Date: Feb 16, 2001